arXiv:cond-mat/9609058v4 [cond-mat.str-el] 18 Jun 1997

Solution of two channel spin-flavor Kondo model

Jinwu Ye

Physics Laboratories, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We investigate a model where an impurity couples to both the spin and the flavor currents of the two channel conduction electrons. This model can be used as a prototype model of a *magnetic* impurity tunneling between two sites in a metal and of some heavy fermion systems where the ground state of the impurity has a fourfold degeneracy. The system is shown to flow to a doubly degenerate *non fermi-liquid*(NFL) fixed point; the thermodynamic quantities show NFL behaviors, but the transport quantities show fermi liquid (FL) behaviors . A spin-flavor coupling double tensor term is shown to drive the system to one of the two singlet FL fixed points. The relation with $SU(4)$ Coqblin-Schrieffer model is studied. The implications on the possible experiments are given.

Typeset using REVTEX

Vladár and Zawadowski [1] suggested that the model of a non-magnetic heavy particle tunneling between two sites in a metal can be mapped to the two channel Kondo model in which the roles of channels and spins in the original formulation are interchanged; this mechanism has been proposed to explain the non-fermi liquid (NFL) behavior observed in the conductance signals of the ballistic metal contacts and in some heavy fermion systems [2]. Recently, Ref. [3,4] reinvestigated this mapping in details. If the heavy particle also carries spin, for example, a muon is injected into a metal, then the heavy particle also interacts with conduction electron gas in the channel(the real spin) sector. Simply speaking, the model of a *magnetic* heavy particle tunneling between two sites in a metal can be mapped to the two channel spin-flavor Kondo model (2CSFK) where the impurity, having both the spin and the flavor degree of freedoms, couples to both the spin and the flavor currents of the two channel conduction electrons. D. L. Cox [5] pointed out that when the ground state of the impurity is a orbital (non-magnetic) doublet, the resulting two channel quadrupolar Kondo effects may explain the NFL behaviors observed in some heavy fermion systems. However, under some symmetry conditions, it is also possible that the impurity has a four fold degenerate ground state which can be described by quadrupole (non-magnetic) moment and magnetic moment (channel) [5,6], the resulting 2CSFK maybe a appropriate model to describe the low temperature physics of such systems.

Various kinds of methods like Bethe ansatz [7], Conformal field theory (CFT) [8], Numerical Renormalization Group(NRG) [9], Abelian bosonization [10] etc. can be used to solve this model. Using NRG, Pang [6] investigated the 2CSFK (both with and without double tensor term Eq.10), unfortunately, most of his results are incorrect. Based on the pioneering work of Affleck and Ludwig (AL) [8], Emery and Kivelson (EK) [10], Maldacena and Ludwig (ML) [11], the author developed a simple and powerful method to study certain class of quantum impurity models [13]. This method circumvent the difficulty to identify the fusion rules of CFT approach. In this paper, using the method, we reinvestigate this model. We find that the system flows to a doubly degenerate ($g = 2$) NFL fixed point where the conduction electrons suffer phase shift $\pm\pi/4$, the spin-spin (also flavor-flavor)

correlation, the pairing correlation and the transport properties of the conduction electrons show *FL* behaviors. However, because the leading irrelevant operators are *NFL* operators, the thermodynamic quantities show *NFL* behaviors. A spin-flavor coupling double tensor term Eq.10 is shown to break the doublet and drive the system to the singlet ($g = 1$) fermi liquid fixed points with phase shifts either $\pi/4$ or $-\pi/4$. All the irrelevant operators near these two singlet FL fixed points are shown to be FL operators. The relation between 2CSFK and $SU(4)$ Coqblin-Schrieffer model is also studied. The important lesson we learned from this model is that it is possible that the transport properties show *FL* behaviors, but thermodynamic quantities show *NFL* behaviors.

We consider the following Hamiltonian of the 2CSFK

$$H = iv_F \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \psi_{i\alpha}^{\dagger}(x) \frac{d\psi_{i\alpha}(x)}{dx} + \sum_{a=x,y,z} \lambda_s^a J_s^a(0) S^a + \sum_{a=x,y,z} \lambda_f^a J_f^a(0) F^a + h_s(\int dx J_s^z(x) + S^z) + h_f(\int dx J_f^z(x) + F^z) \quad (1)$$

where $J_s^a(x) = \frac{1}{2}\psi_{i\alpha}^{\dagger}(x)(\sigma^a)_{\alpha\beta}\psi_{i\beta}(x)$ and $J_f^a(x) = \frac{1}{2}\psi_{i\alpha}^{\dagger}(x)(\sigma^a)_{i,j}\psi_{j\alpha}(x)$ are the spin and the flavor currents of conduction electrons respectively. S^a, F^a $(a = x, y, z)$ are the impurity spin and flavor respectively, the impurity has $g = 2 \times 2 = 4$ states. h_s, h_f are the uniform magnetic and flavor fields respectively. In most of this paper, we limit our discussions to the $O(2)$ symmetry in both spin and flavor sectors.

If $\lambda_s^a = \lambda_s, \lambda_f^a = \lambda_f, h_s = h_f = 0$, then the Hamiltonian Eq.1 has global $SU_s(2) \times SU_f(2) \times U_c(1)$ symmetry. If $\lambda_s = \lambda_f$, there is also a exchange (Z_2) symmetry between spin and flavor sectors. The model also enjoys Particle-Hole (P-H) symmetry : $\psi_{i\alpha}(x) \to \epsilon_{ij}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\psi_{j\beta}^{\dagger}(x)$ and Time-Reversal (T) symmetry : $\psi_{i\alpha}(x) \to (\sigma^2)_{ij}(\sigma^2)_{\alpha\beta}\psi_{j\beta}(-x), \vec{S} \to -\vec{S}, \vec{F} \to -\vec{F}$.

In the following, we closely follow the notations of Emery-Kivelson [10]. Following the three standard steps in EK solution: *step 1* : write Hamiltonian in terms of the chiral bosons introduced in [10]. *step 2*: make the canonical transformation $U = \exp[iS^z\Phi_s(0) + iF^z\Phi_f(0)]$. *step 3*: make the following fermionization:

$$S^x = \frac{\widehat{a}_s}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad S^y = \frac{\widehat{b}_s}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad S^z = -i\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_s = d_s^{\dagger}d_s - \frac{1}{2}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^x = P_F \frac{\widehat{a}_f}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad F^y = P_F \frac{\widehat{b}_f}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad F^z = -i\widehat{a}_f\widehat{b}_f = d_f^\dagger d_f - \frac{1}{2} \\
\psi_{sf,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{sf,i} - ib_{sf,i}) = \frac{P_{sf}}{\sqrt{2\pi a}} e^{-i\Phi_{sf}} \\
\psi_{s,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{s,i} - ib_{s,i}) = \frac{P_s}{\sqrt{2\pi a}} e^{-i\Phi_s} \\
\psi_{f,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_{f,i} - ib_{f,i}) = \frac{P_f}{\sqrt{2\pi a}} e^{-i\Phi_f}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}
$$

Where the cocyle factors are $P_F = e^{i\pi(d_s^\dagger d_s + N_{sf})}, P_{sf} = e^{i\pi d_s^\dagger d_s}, P_s = e^{i\pi(d_s^\dagger d_s + d_f^\dagger d_f + N_{sf})}, P_f = e^{i\pi(d_s^\dagger d_s + d_f^\dagger d_f + N_{sf} + N_s)}$.

The transformed Hamiltonian $H' = H_{sf} + H_s + H_f + \delta H$ can be written in terms of Majorana fermions as [16]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{sf} &= H_{0sf} + + i\frac{\lambda_s}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\widehat{b}_s a_{sf}(0) + i\frac{\lambda_f P_c}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\widehat{a}_f b_{sf}(0) \\
H_s &= H_{0s} - ih_s \int dx a_s(x) b_s(x) \\
H_f &= H_{0f} - ih_f \int dx a_f(x) b_f(x) \\
\delta H &= O_s + O_f, \quad O_s = -\lambda_s^{z\prime}\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_s a_s(0) b_s(0), \quad O_f = -\lambda_f^{z\prime}\widehat{a}_f\widehat{b}_f a_f(0) b_f(0)
\end{aligned} \tag{3}
$$

where $P_c = e^{i\pi N_c}, \lambda_s^{z\prime} = \lambda_s^z - 2\pi v_F, \lambda_f^{z\prime} = \lambda_f^z - 2\pi v_F$ [17].

From the above Majorana fermion basis, it is easy to see that *half* of the impurity spin couple to half of the spin-flavor electrons, *half* of the impurity flavor couple to *another* half of the spin-flavor electrons, this fact make the stable fixed point of the 2CSFK rather different from that of the 2CK.

It is easy to see at $\lambda_s^z = \lambda_f^z = 2\pi v_F$, the spin and flavor bosons Φ_s, Φ_f completely decouple from the impurity, therefore $\chi_{imp}^s = \chi_{imp}^f = 0$. Because the canonical transformation is a boundary condition changing operator [13], this fact leads to the boundary conditions on the solvable line

$$
a_L^s(0) = -a_R^s(0), \quad b_L^s(0) = -b_R^s(0); \qquad a_L^f(0) = -a_R^f(0), \quad b_L^f(0) = -b_R^f(0) \tag{4}
$$

In order to identify the fixed point *along* the EK solvable line $\lambda_s^{z\prime} = 0, \lambda_f^{z\prime} = 0$, we write H_{sf} in the Lagrangian form:

$$S_{sf} = S_{0sf} + \frac{\gamma_s}{2}\int d\tau \widehat{b}_s(\tau)\frac{\partial \widehat{b}_s(\tau)}{\partial \tau} + i\frac{\lambda_s}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\int d\tau \widehat{b}_s(\tau) a_{sf}(0,\tau)$$
$$+ \frac{\gamma_f}{2}\int d\tau \widehat{a}_f(\tau)\frac{\partial \widehat{a}_f(\tau)}{\partial \tau} + i\frac{\lambda_f P_c}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\int d\tau \widehat{a}_f(\tau) b_{sf}(0,\tau) \quad (5)$$

Following Ref. [13], when performing the RG analysis of Eq.5, we keep λ_s and λ_f fixed, simple power countings lead to the following RG flow equations

$$\frac{d\gamma_s}{dl} = -\gamma_s$$
$$\frac{d\gamma_f}{dl} = -\gamma_f \quad (6)$$

It is easy to see that the *only* stable fixed point is located at $\gamma_s = \gamma_f = 0$ where $\widehat{b}_s$ and $\widehat{a}_f$ lose their kinetic energies and become two Grassmann Lagrangian multipliers; integrating them out leads to the *boundary conditions* [13] :

$$a_L^{sf}(0) = -a_R^{sf}(0), \quad b_L^{sf}(0) = -b_R^{sf}(0) \quad (7)$$

Boundary conditions 4 and 7 can be expressed in terms of bosons:

$$\Phi_L^s = \Phi_R^s + \pi, \quad \Phi_L^{sf} = \Phi_R^{sf} + \pi, \quad \Phi_L^f = \Phi_R^f + \pi \quad (8)$$

Assuming no potential scattering, we also have:

$$\Phi_L^c = \Phi_R^c \quad (9)$$

Substituting the above two Eqs. into their standard definitions [10], we find all the four Dirac fermions suffer the same phase shift $\delta = \pm\frac{\pi}{4}$. it is well known that in the presence of P-H symmetry, the phase shift can only be 0 or $\pi/2$, however the ground state of this model is a *doublet*, one causes phase shift $\frac{\pi}{4}$, another causes phase shift $-\frac{\pi}{4}$, each breaks P-H symmetry and related to each other by P-H transformation [14]. The symmetry of this fixed point is $O(6)\times O(2) \sim SU(4)\times O(2)$. The finite size $-l < x < l$ spectrum will be that of 4 free Dirac fermions with $\pm\frac{\pi}{4}$ phase shift.

The above results can also be reached from CFT. In order to get the finite size spectrum at the stable fixed point, we have to do two fusions simultaneously from the free electrons

spectrum, one in the spin sector, another in the flavor sector. It can be shown explicitly that the resulting spectrum is indeed equivalent to the *superposition* of phase shift $\frac{\pi}{4}$ and phase shift $-\frac{\pi}{4}$. As shown in Ref. [13], it is more convenient and more compact to calculate the finite size spectrum according to the *maximum* symmetry $O(6) \times O(2)$ of the fixed point. we find the ground state energy is $\frac{1}{8}$ with the degeneracy 2 [14]. The excitation spectrums are equally spaced with $\Delta E = 1/4$. The complete finite size spectrum of this fixed point is listed in [4]. However, Pang got *a line of NFL fixed points* with continuously changing phase shifts [6,14].

Exactly at this fixed point, the impurity degeneracy is $g = \sqrt{2} \times \sqrt{2} = 2$, so $S_{imp}(T = 0) = \log 2$. One particle S matrix is $S_1 = \pm i$, as in 2CK, the residual resistivity is also half of the unitarity limit $\rho(0) = \frac{\rho_u}{2}$. The scaling dimensions of the various fields at this fixed point are: $[\widehat{b}_s] = [\widehat{a}_f] = 1/2, [a_{sf}] = [b_{sf}] = 3/2, [\widehat{a}_s] = [\widehat{b}_f] = 0$. The impurity spin and flavor correlation functions show the typical 2CK *NFL* behaviors $\langle S^z(\tau) S^z(0) \rangle \sim 1/\tau, \langle F^z(\tau) F^z(0) \rangle \sim 1/\tau$. We find two *leading irrelevant* operators O_s, O_f with dimension 3/2 which will generate two dimension 2 operators $a_s(0,\tau)\frac{\partial a_s(0,\tau)}{\partial \tau} + b_s(0,\tau)\frac{\partial b_s(0,\tau)}{\partial \tau}, a_f(0,\tau)\frac{\partial a_f(0,\tau)}{\partial \tau} + b_f(0,\tau)\frac{\partial b_f(0,\tau)}{\partial \tau}$, the other two dimension 2 operators are the γ_s and γ_f terms in Eq.5. In all, there are four *sub-leading irrelevant* operators with dimension 2. The straightforward extension of the CFT analysis in Ref. [12] shows that there are two dimension 3/2 operators T^s_{00}, T^f_{00} and four dimension 2 operators $P^s_1, P^s_2; P^f_1, P^f_2$, in consistent with the above analysis.

Although the ground state is a doublet which are spin singlet, flavor singlet with charges ± 1, however, all *allowed* boundary operators must be *neutral*, therefore, will *not* mix the doublet [18]; the *non-degenerate* perturbation theory can still be used to calculate the thermodynamic and transport properties. The only operator which can mix this doublet is the spin-singlet, flavor-singlet pair operator, although this operator is not a *allowed* boundary operator, but it is responsible for the enhanced pairing susceptibility of the 2CK [13]. In the case of FL boundary conditions as happened in the present model, this operator vanishes [19,13]. There is *no* pairing susceptibility enhancement in the 2CSFK. The electron spin-spin (flavor-flavor) correlation and the pairing operator correlation are exactly the *same*

with those of the free electrons. Following the calculations in Refs. [13,15], it is easy to see that the low temperature correction to the electron resistivity is controlled by the *sub-leading* irrelevant operators with dimension 2 in contrast to 2CK where it is controlled by the *leading* irrelevant operators with dimension 3/2. At low temperature, the second order perturbation in these operators yield $\rho(T) - \frac{\rho_u}{2} \sim T^2$. However, similar to the 2CK, the impurity susceptibility and specific heat are still controlled by the dimension 3/2 leading irrelevant operators. $C_{imp} \sim (\lambda_{zs}'^2 + \lambda_{zf}'^2)T \log T, \chi^s_{imp} \sim \lambda_{zs}'^2 \log T, \chi^f_{imp} \sim \lambda_{zf}'^2 \log T$, the *combined* Wilson ratio $R = \frac{T(\chi^s_{imp}+\chi^f_{imp})}{C_{imp}}$ is universal [20]. Pang got totally different results for the physical measurable quantities mentioned above.

The potential scattering term can be added to the Hamiltonian 1, it breaks P-H symmetry and causes a continuous phase shift in the charge sector, the symmetry of the fixed line is $SU(4) \times U(1) \sim U(4)$ with $g = 2$.

A *spin-flavor coupling* double tensor term can also be added:

$$\lambda^{ab} J^{ab}(0) S^a F^b \tag{10}$$

where $J^{ab}(x) = \frac{1}{4}\psi^\dagger_{i\alpha}(x)(\sigma^a)_{ij}(\sigma^b)_{\alpha\beta}\psi_{j\beta}(x)$.

It can be shown that the double tensor term still respects global $SU_s(2) \times SU_f(2) \times U_c(1)$ symmetry if $\lambda^{ab} = \lambda$, it is *odd* under P-H, *even* under T. For simplicity, we consider $O_s(2) \times O_f(2) \times U_c(1)$ case where $\lambda_{11} = \lambda_{12} = \lambda_{21} = \lambda_{22}, \lambda_{13} = \lambda_{23}, \lambda_{31} = \lambda_{32}$.

It is instructive to compare the model with the $SU(N)$ Coqblin-Schrieffer(CS) model [22]

$$H_{cs} = \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} C^\dagger_{k\alpha} C_{k\alpha} + J[C^\dagger_\alpha(0) C_\beta(0) d^\dagger_\beta d_\alpha - \frac{1}{N} C^\dagger_\alpha(0) d^\dagger_\beta d_\beta C_\alpha(0)] \tag{11}$$

where $\alpha, \beta = 1, \cdots, N$, with the constraint $d^\dagger_\beta d_\beta = m$, the summation over repeated indices is implied.

The phase shift at the FL fixed point of the $SU(N)$ CS model satisfies the Friedel sum rule $\delta = \frac{m}{N}\pi$. Under P-H transformation $d_\alpha \to d^\dagger_\alpha, C_{k,\alpha} \to C^\dagger_{-k,\alpha}$; $m \to N - m$. For *even* N, if $m = \frac{N}{2}$, then $\delta = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the CS model has P-H symmetry.

In contrast to the claim by Pang [6], the model described by Eqs. 1 and 10 is *not* equivalent to $SU(4)$ Coqblin-Schrieffer(CS) Model for any values of parameters, because the two models have *different* global symmetry.

Following the three standard steps in EK solution, the double tensor term Eq.10 can be written as:

$$i\frac{\lambda_{11}P_c}{4\pi a}\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_f+\frac{\lambda_{13}P_c}{2\sqrt{2\pi a}}\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_f\widehat{b}_s a_{sf}(0)-\frac{\lambda_{31}}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_f\widehat{a}_f b_{sf}(0)-i\frac{\lambda_{33}}{2}\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_f\widehat{b}_s a_{sf}(0)\widehat{a}_f b_{sf}(0) \quad (12)$$

The first term in Eq.12 has scaling dimension 0, therefore is a relevant perturbation to the fixed point of the 2CSFK. In order to locate the stable fixed point, we define a *artificial* impurity spin $L^z=-i\widehat{a}_s\widehat{b}_f$, therefore we can write Eq.12 as

$$L^z[-\frac{\lambda_{11}P_c}{4\pi a}+i\frac{\lambda_{13}P_c}{2\sqrt{2\pi a}}\widehat{b}_s a_{sf}(0)-i\frac{\lambda_{31}}{\sqrt{2\pi a}}\widehat{a}_f b_{sf}(0)+\frac{\lambda_{33}}{2}\widehat{b}_s a_{sf}(0)\widehat{a}_f b_{sf}(0)] \quad (13)$$

Under P-H, $L^z\rightarrow -L^z$, $L^z=\pm\frac{1}{2}$ are *exact* eigenstates of Eq.13. It is easy to see λ_{11} plays the role of the *artificial* magnetic field which couples to the *artificial* impurity spin L^z. Depending on the sign of λ_{11}, the impurity ground state will be either $L^z=\frac{1}{2}$ or $L^z=-\frac{1}{2}$, the excited state can be projected out without affecting the low energy properties, the system flows to one of the two $g=1$ stable fixed points where $\langle\widehat{a}_s(\tau)\widehat{a}_s(0)\rangle\sim(\frac{\lambda_s^{z\prime}}{\lambda_{11}})^2\frac{1}{\tau}$, $\langle\widehat{b}_f(\tau)\widehat{b}_f(0)\rangle\sim(\frac{\lambda_f^{z\prime}}{\lambda_{11}})^2\frac{1}{\tau}$, therefore $[\widehat{a}_s]=[\widehat{b}_f]=\frac{1}{2}$. λ_{13} and λ_{31} in Eq.13 can be combined with λ_s and λ_f in Eq.3 respectively, therefore the boundary conditions of the two $g=1$ fixed points are *still given* by Eqs.8,9, namely both have $O(4)\times O(2)$ symmetry and are P-H conjugated; both have the same finite size spectrum which can be achieved by reducing the degeneracies of all the energy levels by 2 of that of the $g=2$ fixed point. this is another non-trivial example of AL's g-theorem [21]. The impurity spin and flavor correlation functions show typical FL behaviors $\langle S^z(\tau)S^z(0)\rangle\sim\langle F^z(\tau)F^z(0)\rangle\sim\langle S^z(\tau)F^z(0)\rangle\sim 1/\tau^2$. The fixed point with $L^z=\frac{1}{2},\delta=\frac{\pi}{4},S=i$ is the *same* fixed point as $SU(4)$ CS model with $m=1$ local fermion, another with $L^z=-\frac{1}{2},\delta=-\frac{\pi}{4},S=-i$ is the *same* fixed point as $SU(4)$ CS model with $m=3$ local fermions, therefore both have the *same* boundary operator contents as their corresponding CS models. However, because the two models have different global symmetry, the *allowed* boundary operators are *different*.

There are 6 *leading irrelevant* operators with scaling dimension 2. $O_s \sim \partial\Phi_{sf}\partial\Phi_s, O_f \sim \partial\Phi_{sf}\partial\Phi_f$ are two dimension 2 operators, The other 4 dimension 2 operators are the same as the *sub-leading* irrelevant operators near the $g = 2$ fixed point, but they become the *leading* irrelevant operators near the $g = 1$ fixed points. The λ_{33} term in Eq.13 has scaling dimension 4. It is easy to see that all the boundary operators must have *integer* scaling dimensions $h \geq 2$, therefore are *FL* boundary operators.

Because the P-H symmetry is always absent, the double tensor term is always present, this make the experimental observation of the *mixed* behaviors: $S_{imp} = \log 2, C_{imp} \sim T \log T, \chi_{imp} \sim \log T, \rho(T) \sim \rho(0) + T^2$ very unlikely.

We thank D. S. Fisher, B. Halperin, I. Smolyarenko especially D. Cox and N. Read for helpful discussions. This research was supported by NSF Grants Nos. DMR 9106237 and DMR9400396.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Vladár and A. Zawadowski, Phys. Rev. B28, 1564(1983); 28, 1582(1983); 28, 1596(1983).

[2] D. C. Ralph and R. A. Buhrman, Phy. Rev. Lett. 69, 2118 (1992); D. C. Ralph, A. W. W. Ludwig, Jan von Delft and R. A. Buhrman, *ibid.* 72, 1064(1994); C. L. Seaman, *et. al*, *ibid.* 67, 2882(1991).

[3] A. L. Moustakas and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 51,6908 (1995), 53, 4300 (1996)

[4] Jinwu Ye, cond-mat/9609076.

[5] D. L. Cox, Phy. Rev. Lett. 59, 1240 (1987)

[6] H. Pang, Phy. Rev. Lett. 73, 2736 (1994)

[7] N. Andrei and C. Destri, Phys. Rev. Lett. 52, 364(1984); A. M. Tsvelik and P. B. Wiegmann, Z. Phys. B54, 201 (1984); A. M. Tsvelik, J. Phys. C18, 159(1985).

[8] I. Affleck and A. W. W. Ludwig, Nucl. Phys. B360, 641(1990)

[9] I. Affleck, A. W. W. Ludwig, H. B. Pang and D. L. Cox Phys. Rev. B45, 7918(1992)

[10] V. J. Emery and S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B46, 10812(1992) , Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 3701.

[11] J. M. Maldacena and A. W. W. Ludwig, to be published in Nucl. Phys. B.

[12] Jinwu Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 3224 (1996).

[13] Jinwu Ye, cond-mat/9612029 and references therein.

[14] This doublet is obtained by taking $l \to \infty$ first, then $T \to 0$. The ground state degeneracy of finite size spectrum is obtained by $T \to 0$ first, then $l \to \infty$, it turns out also to be 2 with charge ± 1. These two degeneracies are usually *different* because the two limits donn't commute [8]. Pang's NRG results can only give the *finite size* degeneracy.

[15] Jinwu Ye, cond-mat/9609057.

[16] The differences between $\psi_{s,i}, \psi_{sf,i}$ and ψ_s, ψ_{sf} are neglected in the following without affacting any results.

[17] P_c is simply a constant, because N_c is conserved.

[18] For ferromagnetic Kondo model, the ground state degeneracy is also 2, but the two states are *mixed* by the irrelevant operator which is the spin fliping part of the Kondo interaction. This is responsible for the NFL behaviours in the one channel ferromagnetic Kondo model.

[19] A. W. W. Ludwig and I. Affleck, Nucl. Phys. B428, 545(1994); I. Affleck and A. W. W. Ludwig, Phys. Rev. B48,7297(1993).

[20] N. B. Bhatt and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 3072 (1992). They discussed the metallic phase of disordered metal and showed that the low temperature thermodynamic quantities show NFL behaviours, but the charge transport still shows FL behaviours. This is due to *residual* local moments which are essentially decoupled from the conduction electron fluids at any low temperature.

[21] I. Affleck and A. W. W. Ludwig, Phy. Rev. Lett. 67, 161(1991)

[22] N. Read and D. M. Newns, J. Phys. C16, 3273(1983)